

REMARKS***Status of Claims***

The Office Action mailed October April 17, 2008 has been received and reviewed. By the present Response and Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-16, 19, and 21 remain pending. Independent claims 1, 12, and 16 are amended herein. No new matter is introduced by the present Response and Amendment. Entry of this response is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) as placing the case in condition for allowance or, alternatively, as placing the case in better form for appeal. All claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-16, 19, and 7-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-16, 19, and 7-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 7,080,141 of *Baekelmans et al.* and U.S. Patent No. 6,857,013 of *Ramberg et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, and 16 to clarify the claimed invention. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the Applicant's specification and particularly on page 4, paragraph 16 and page 5, paragraph 20.

The present invention is directed to a system and method for troubleshooting a service problem in a telecommunications network. A user using his wireless device can connect directly with a network server. The network server receives the user's direct input regarding the service problem identified by the user, diagnoses the problem, and then automatically corrects the problem without intervention by an operator of the system.

By stark contrast, the system of *Baekelmans* relates to a network system that automatically monitors a network device and resolves problems before a failure occurs. Nothing in *Baekelmans* discloses, teaches, or suggests receiving information about system conditions associated with the service problem directly from the user of a wireless telecommunications device, as claimed. Rather, *Baekelmans* continuously monitors the status of the network device and then takes steps to correct any revealed problem. This is contrary to what is claimed, as the user of the wireless telecommunications device (such as

a cell phone) communicates directly with a server and inputs information related to a service problem, which is then corrected by the server. In other words, the user of the wireless telecommunications device doesn't need to call customer service to resolve the problem. *Ramberg* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Baekelmans* as *Ramberg* appears to be cited only for its teaching of a wireless mobile device. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of application. It is believed that entry of this response and consideration of the remarks above is proper under 37 CFR 1.116(b) as placing the case in condition for allowance or, alternatively, placing the case in better form for appeal. Should there be any further questions or concerns, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
GARDNER GROFF
GREENWALD & VILLANUEVA, PC

/Michelle E. Kandcer/
Michelle E. Kandcer, Reg. No. 54,207

GARDNER GROFF GREENWALD & VILLANUEVA, PC
Customer Number 39513
Phone: 770.984.2300
Fax: 770.984.0098